



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/067,112

02/04/2002

Henricus Renier Gerardus Steeghs

ASC5695US2

7400

7590

10/27/2003

LAINIE E. PARKER
AKZO NOBEL INC.
7 LIVINGSTONE AVENUE
DOBBS FERRY, NY 10522-3408

EXAMINER

ANDREWS, MELVYN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1742

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Applicati n No.

10/067,112

Applicant(s)

STEEGHS ET AL.

Examiner

Melvyn J. Andrews

Art Unit

1742

--The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cov r she t with the correspondenc address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 08 October 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,4,7,8,17,19-21,41,43 and 47.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9,11,12,15,16,22,24-26,37-40,42 and 44-46.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Melvyn Andrews
MELVYN ANDREWS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The negative limitation "but wherein the commingling occurs in the absence ..." in both "Claim 49. (Presently Added)" and "Claim 49 (Previously Added)" is new matter; also, the identification of these two claims is apparently a typographical error. Applicants' arguments with respect to Banyai et al , Rooda et al and Stafford are not persuasive . With respect to Banyai et al the properties of the pellets produced by the Banyai et al process would obviously be expected to be similar because both citric acid and sodium citrate would be expected to be present when moistened . Rooda et al discloses that tartaric acid is equivalent to citric acid so that it would be obvious to expect that a process of agglomerating with tartaric acid would be useful to form an agglomerate. Stafford discloses a method of forming soil building blocks (col.13, line 69 to col.14, line 28) which are obviously similar to ore agglomerates.